Masses of physical scalars in two Higgs doublet models

Ambalika Biswas* and Amitabha Lahiri†

S. N. Bose National Centre For Basic Sciences,

Block JD, Sector III, Salt Lake, Kolkata 700098, INDIA

(Dated: June 19, 2015)

arXiv:1412.6187v3 [hep-ph] 18 Jun 2015

Abstract

We find bounds on scalar masses resulting from a criterion of naturalness, in a broad class of two Higgs doublet models (2HDMs). Specifically, we assume the cancellation of quadratic divergences in what are called the type I, type II, lepton-specific and flipped 2HDMs, with an additional U(1) symmetry. This results in a set of relations among masses of the physical scalars and coupling constants, a generalization of the Veltman conditions of the Standard Model. Assuming that the lighter CP-even neutral Higgs particle is the observed scalar particle of mass $\sim$125 GeV, and imposing further the constraints from the electroweak T-parameter, stability, and perturbative unitarity, we calculate the range of the mass of each of the remaining physical scalars.

* ambalika12t@boson.bose.res.in

† amitabha@bose.res.in

I. INTRODUCTION

With the discovery of a 125 GeV neutral scalar boson [1, 2], the menagerie of fundamental particles in the Standard Model appears to be complete. Some questions still remain unanswered, including the origins of neutrino mass and dark matter, keeping the door open for physics beyond the Standard Model. Among the simplest extensions of the Standard Model are two Higgs doublet models (2HDMs) (for a recent review see [3]). Originally motivated by supersymmetry, where a second Higgs doublet is essential, 2HDMs have also been studied in several other contexts. Peccei-Quinn symmetry [4, 5] solves the strong CP problem, but must be spontaneously broken. The corresponding Goldstone boson is the axion, which can be a combination of the phases of two Higgs doublets. Models of baryogenesis often involve 2HDMs [6] because their mass spectrum can be adjusted to produce CP violation, both explicit and spontaneous. Another motivation, one that is important to us, is their use in models of dark matter [7–9]. These models are the inert doublet models, so called because one of the Higgs doublets does not couple to the fermions. Of the 2HDMs we will consider, the Yukawa couplings of one model (type I) approach the inert doublet model for large values of the ratio of the vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of the two Higgs fields. The other models also have small couplings to one or more types of fermions in that limit.

In this paper we consider 2HDMs with a softly broken global U(1) symmetry [4, 10], with the parameters chosen so as to make the 2HDM 'SM-like'. We choose the fermion transformations under this U(1) symmetry, and impose a naturalness condition of vanishing quadratic divergences on the scalar sector of the models. Using additional restrictions coming from partial wave unitarity, vacuum stability, and the T parameter measuring 'new physics', and assuming that the lighter CP-even Higgs particle in the 2HDMs is the one observed at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), we find bounds on the masses of the additional scalar particles for each of the 2HDMs.

We will work with the scalar potential [11, 12]

$$
\begin{aligned}
V = & \lambda_1 \left(|\Phi_1|^2 - \frac{v_1^2}{2} \right)^2 + \lambda_2 \left(|\Phi_2|^2 - \frac{v_2^2}{2} \right)^2 \\
& + \lambda_3 \left(|\Phi_1|^2 + |\Phi_2|^2 - \frac{v_1^2 + v_2^2}{2} \right)^2 \\
& + \lambda_4 \left(|\Phi_1|^2 |\Phi_2|^2 - |\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2|^2 \right) \\
& + \lambda_5 \left| \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \right|^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{1.1}
$$

with real λ_i. This potential is invariant under the symmetry $\Phi_1 \to e^{i\theta}\Phi_1\,, \Phi_2 \to \Phi_2\,$, except for a soft breaking term $\lambda_5 v_1 v_2 \Re(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)\,$. Additional dimension-4 terms, including one allowed by a softly broken Z_2 symmetry [13] are also set to zero by this U(1) symmetry.

The scalar doublets are parametrized as

$$
\Phi_i = \begin{pmatrix} w_i^+(x) \\ \dfrac{v_i + h_i(x) + i z_i(x)}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} , \qquad i = 1, 2 \tag{1.2}
$$

where the VEVs v_i may be taken to be real and positive without any loss of generality. Three of these fields get "eaten" by the $W^\pm$ and Z^0 gauge bosons; the remaining five are physical scalar (Higgs) fields. There is a pair of charged scalars denoted by $\xi^\pm$, two neutral CP even scalars H and $h\,$, and one CP odd pseudoscalar denoted by A. With

$$
\tan\beta = \frac{v_2}{v_1}\,, \tag{1.3}
$$

these fields are given by the combinations

$$
\begin{pmatrix} \omega^\pm \\ \xi^\pm \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_\beta & s_\beta \\ -s_\beta & c_\beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_1^\pm \\ w_2^\pm \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.4}
$$

$$
\begin{pmatrix} \zeta \\ A \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_\beta & s_\beta \\ -s_\beta & c_\beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.5}
$$

$$
\begin{pmatrix} H \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_\alpha & s_\alpha \\ -s_\alpha & c_\alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.6}
$$

where $c_\alpha \equiv \cos\alpha$ etc.

If we rotated $h_1 - h_2$ fields by the angle β,

$$
\begin{pmatrix} H^0 \\ R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_\beta & s_\beta \\ -s_\beta & c_\beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.7}
$$

we would find that H^0 has exactly the Standard Model Higgs couplings with the fermions and gauge bosons [14, 15]. The physical scalar h is related to H^0 and R via

$$h = \sin(\beta-\alpha)H^0 + \cos(\beta-\alpha)R\,. \tag{1.8}$$

Thus in order for h to be the Higgs boson of the Standard Model, we require $\sin(\beta-\alpha) \approx 1$, which has been called the SM-like or alignment limit [16]. Accordingly, we will assume $\beta-\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$ in the rest of this paper.

II. VELTMAN CONDITIONS

The scalar masses get quadratically divergent contributions which require a fine-tuning of parameters. We thus impose naturalness conditions, a generalization of the Veltman conditions for the Standard Model, that these contributions cancel [17]. The resulting masses and couplings should not then require fine-tuning.

The Yukawa potential for the 2HDMs is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \sum_{i=1,2}\left[-\bar{l}_L\Phi_i G_e^i e_R - \bar{Q}_L\tilde{\Phi}_i G_u^i u_R - \bar{Q}_L\Phi_i G_d^i d_R + h.c.\right]\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where $l_L\,, Q_L$ are 3-vectors of isodoublets in the space of generations, $e_R\,, u_R\,, d_R$ are 3-vectors of singlets, G_e^1 etc. are complex 3×3 matrices in generation space containing the Yukawa coupling constants, and $\tilde{\Phi}_i = i\tau_2\Phi_i^*$.

Cancellation of quadratic divergences in the scalar masses gives rise to four mass relations, which we may call the Veltman conditions for the 2HDMs being considered [18],

$$2\mathrm{Tr}\,G_e^1 G_e^{1\dagger} + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_u^{1\dagger}G_u^1 + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_d^1 G_d^{1\dagger} = \frac{9}{4}g^2 + \frac{3}{4}g'^2 + 6\lambda_1 + 10\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5\,, \tag{2.2}$$

$$2\mathrm{Tr}\,G_e^2 G_e^{2\dagger} + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_u^{2\dagger}G_u^2 + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_d^2 G_d^{2\dagger} = \frac{9}{4}g^2 + \frac{3}{4}g'^2 + 6\lambda_2 + 10\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5\,, \tag{2.3}$$

$$2\mathrm{Tr}\,G_e^1 G_e^{2\dagger} + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_u^{1\dagger}G_u^2 + 6\mathrm{Tr}\,G_d^1 G_d^{2\dagger} = 0\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where g, g' are the $SU(2)$ and $U(1)_Y$ coupling constants. A fourth equation is the complex conjugate of the third one. As we will see below, the last equation vanish identically for all the 2HDMs we consider. The mass relations come from the first two equations above.

When the fermions are in mass eigenstates, the Yukawa matrices are automatically diagonal if there is only one Higgs doublet as in the Standard Model, so there is no FCNC at

the tree level. But in the presence of a second scalar doublet, the two Yukawa matrices will not be simultaneously diagonalizable in general, and thus the Yukawa couplings will not be flavor diagonal. Neutral Higgs scalars will mediate FCNCs. The necessary and sufficient condition for the absence of FCNC at tree level is that all fermions of a given charge and helicity transform according to the same irreducible representation of SU(2), corresponding to the same eigenvalue of T_3 , and that a basis exists in which they receive their contributions in the mass matrix from a single source [19, 20].

For the fermions of the Standard Model, this theorem implies that all right-handed singlets of a given charge must couple to the same Higgs doublet. We will ensure this using the global U(1) symmetry mentioned earlier, which generalizes a Z_2 symmetry more commonly employed for this purpose. The left handed fermion doublets remain unchanged under this symmetry, $Q_L \to Q_L\,, l_L \to l_L$. The transformations of right handed fermion singlets determine the type of 2HDM. There are four such possibilities, which may be identified by the right-handed fields which transform under the U(1): type I (none), type II $(d_R \to e^{-i\theta} d_R\,, e_R \to e^{-i\theta} e_R)$, lepton specific $(e_R \to e^{-i\theta} e_R)$, flipped $(d_R \to e^{-i\theta} d_R)$. We note in passing that another way of avoiding FCNCs at tree level is by aligning the Yukawa and mass matrices in flavor space [21]. However, only these four 2HDMs admit symmetries such as the U(1) [22].

The fermion mass matrix is diagonalized by independent unitary transformations on the left and right-handed fermion fields. In any of the 2HDMs, either G_{1f} or G_{2f} vanish for each fermion type f . For example, in the Type II model Φ_1 couples to down-type quarks and charged leptons, while Φ_2 couples to up-type quarks, so $G_{2e} = G_{2d} = G_{1u} = 0$. Thus Eq. (2.4) is automatically satisfied in each 2HDM. The non-vanishing Yukawa matrices are related to the fermion masses by [18]

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,[G_{1f}^\dagger G_{1f}] = \frac{2}{v^2 \cos^2\beta} \sum m_f^2\,, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,[G_{2f}^\dagger G_{2f}] = \frac{2}{v^2 \sin^2\beta} \sum m_f^2\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where f stands for charged leptons, up-type quarks, or down-type quarks, and the sum is taken over generations.

In order to rewrite the Veltman conditions in terms of the known masses, we first note that in the alignment limit and with the global U(1) symmetry, the independent parameters in the scalar potential may be taken to be the masses $m_h\,, m_H\,, m_\xi$, the angle β , the electroweak

VEV $v = \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2}$, and the constant λ_5. The λ_i are related to these parameters by [25]

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2v^2 c_\beta^2} m_H^2 - \frac{\lambda_5}{4}(\tan^2\beta - 1)\,, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2v^2 s_\beta^2} m_H^2 - \frac{\lambda_5}{4}\left(\frac{1}{\tan^2\beta} - 1\right)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\lambda_3 = -\frac{1}{2v^2}(m_H^2 - m_h^2) - \frac{\lambda_5}{4}\,, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{2}{v^2} m_\xi^2\,, \qquad \lambda_5 = \frac{2}{v^2} m_A^2\,. \tag{2.10}$$

Inserting Eq. (2.5) — Eq. (2.10) into Eq. (2.2) and Eq. (2.3), we get the Veltman conditions in terms of the physical particle masses. These are shown in Table I. The Yukawa matrices which vanish in each model are listed in the second column. We note here that although naturalness conditions in specific 2HDMs have been studied earlier on a few occasions [23, 24], they were not done in the SM-like scenario, nor expressed in terms of the physical masses for the different types as in here.

Model	zero Yukawa	VC1	VC2
		$6M_W^2 + 3M_Z^2 + 5m_h^2 + 2m_\xi^2$ $+ m_H^2(3\tan^2\beta - 2) - \frac{3v^2}{2}\lambda_5 \tan^2\beta =$	$6M_W^2 + 3M_Z^2 + 5m_h^2 + 2m_\xi^2$ $+ m_H^2\left(3\cot^2\beta - 2\right) - \frac{3v^2}{2}\lambda_5 \cot^2\beta =$
Type I	$G_{1e}\,, G_{1d}\,, G_{1u}$	0	$4\left[\sum m_e^2 + 3\sum m_u^2 + 3\sum m_d^2\right]\csc^2\beta$
Type II	$G_{2e}\,, G_{2d}\,, G_{1u}$	$4\left[\sum m_e^2 + 3\sum m_d^2\right]\sec^2\beta$	$12\sum m_u^2 \csc^2\beta$
LS	$G_{2e}\,, G_{1d}\,, G_{1u}$	$4\sum m_e^2 \sec^2\beta$	$12\left[\sum m_u^2 + \sum m_d^2\right]\csc^2\beta$
Flipped	$G_{1e}\,, G_{2d}\,, G_{1u}$	$12\sum m_d^2 \sec^2\beta$	$4\left[\sum m_e^2 + 3\sum m_u^2\right]\csc^2\beta$

TABLE I. Veltman conditions for the different 2HDMs

III. BOUNDS ON THE MASSES OF HEAVY AND CHARGED SCALARS

We now display our main results, the bounds we have obtained for the masses of the heavy and charged Higgs particles. We will assume that the h particle is the one that has been observed at the LHC, so that $m_h = 125$ GeV, and $v = 246$ GeV. Let us consider the example of the type II model to explain our derivation of the bounds.

Since we want the bounds on m_H and m_ξ, let us rewrite VC1 and VC2 for the type II

model in a convenient form,

$$m_H^2\left(3\tan^2\beta-2\right)+2m_\xi^2 = 4\left[\sum m_e^2+3\sum m_d^2\right]\sec^2\beta-6M_W^2-3M_Z^2-5m_h^2+\lambda_5\frac{3v^2}{2}\tan^2\beta\,, \tag{3.1}$$

$$m_H^2\left(3\cot^2\beta-2\right)+2m_\xi^2 = 12\sum m_u^2\csc^2\beta-6M_W^2-3M_Z^2-5m_h^2+\lambda_5\frac{3v^2}{2}\cot^2\beta\,. \tag{3.2}$$

On the right hand side of either equation, all but the last term are experimentally known. The $U(1)$ symmetry implies that $\lambda_5>0$, and we impose the restriction of $|\lambda_i|\le 4\pi$ based on the validity of perturbativity. Comparing with Eq. (2.10), we see that this last puts a restriction $m_A \lesssim 617\text{GeV}$.

For a fixed value of $\tan\beta$, we plot both equations on the $m_H - m_\xi$ plane for various values of λ_5. The point where the two curves cross for a given value of λ_5, is an allowed value of the pair $(m_H\,, m_\xi)$.

We can restrict the allowed range of the masses even further by imposing constraints coming from stability, perturbative unitarity, and the oblique electroweak T-parameter. Conditions for stability, i.e. for the scalar potential being bounded from below, were examined in [3, 15, 29], and found to provide lower bounds on certain combinations of the quartic couplings λ_i. On the other hand, the requirement of perturbative unitarity translates into upper limits on combinations of the λ_i, which for two-Higgs models have been derived by many authors [25, 30–32]. One condition coming from perturbative unitarity is

$$\left|3(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+2\lambda_3)\pm\sqrt{9(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2+(4\lambda_3+\lambda_4+\lambda_5)^2}\right| \le 16\pi \tag{3.3}$$

Stability provides the inequalities

$$\lambda_1+\lambda_3>0\,,\qquad \lambda_2+\lambda_3>0\,, \tag{3.4}$$

so that we can write Eq. (3.3) as $|A\pm B|\le 16\pi$, with $A\,, B\ge 0$. It then follows that

$$0\le\lambda_1+\lambda_2+2\lambda_3\le\frac{16\pi}{3}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

In terms of the scalar masses, this reads

$$0<(m_H^2-m_A^2)(\tan^2\beta+\cot^2\beta)+2m_h^2<\frac{32\pi v^2}{3}. \tag{3.6}$$

For $\tan\beta\gg 1$, this inequality implies that m_H and m_A are almost degenerate, a result also found in [33]. In Fig. 1 we have shown this degeneracy by plotting m_A against m_H

for different values of $\tan\beta$. It is easy to see from the plots that the degeneracy is more pronounced at higher values of m_A for any value of $\tan\beta$. For these plots we have used the perturbativity condition $|\lambda_i| \leq 4\pi$, which restricts $m_A \lesssim 617$ GeV.



FIG. 1. Degeneracy of $m_H - m_A$ (in GeV) for progressively increasing $\tan\beta$. The condition $|\lambda_i| \leq 4\pi$ restricts $m_A \lesssim 617$ GeV.

We will also need another inequality which follows from the condition

$$|2\lambda_3 + \lambda_4| \leq 16\pi \tag{3.7}$$

required for perturbative unitarity. Substituting the mass relations Eq. (2.9) and (2.10) into

this, we get

$$\left|2m_\xi^2 - m_H^2 - m_A^2 + m_h^2\right| \leq 16\pi v^2\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Next we take into account the oblique parameter T for the 2HDMs, which has the expression [34, 35]

$$T = \frac{1}{16\pi \sin^2\theta_W M_W^2}\left[F(m_\xi^2, m_H^2) + F(m_\xi^2, m_A^2) - F(m_H^2, m_A^2)\right], \tag{3.9}$$

with

$$F(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x+y}{2} - \frac{xy}{x-y}\ln\frac{x}{y}\,, & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

The T parameter is constrained by the global fit to precision electroweak data to be [36]

$$T = 0.05 \pm 0.12. \tag{3.11}$$

Our results consist of the pairs (m_H, m_ξ) for each type of 2HDM, satisfying the two Veltman conditions, and consistent with the constraints from stability, tree-level unitarity and the T parameter. For $\tan\beta = 5$, we have plotted the $m_H - m_\xi$ curves corresponding to VC1 and VC2 for several values of λ_5. These have been superimposed on the bound determined by (3.6), (3.8), and (3.11). The resulting plot is shown in Fig. 2. VC1 produces ellipses, and VC2 gives a narrow band of hyperbolae. Their crossings which fall inside the band representing the bound from the inequalities are the allowed masses. From the plot we can estimate the individual bounds: for all four models, we find approximately 550 GeV $\lesssim m_\xi \lesssim$ 700 GeV, and about 450 GeV $\lesssim m_H \lesssim$ 620 GeV, with a higher m_H implying a higher m_ξ. As mentioned earlier, m_A is close to m_H as a result of (3.6). We also note that direct searches have put a rough lower bound of $m_\xi > 100$ GeV [26].

IV. DISCUSSION

Some comments are in order for the values of some parameters that we have used in this analysis. We chose $\beta - \alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$ so that the 2HDMs are in the alignment limit, in which the lighter CP-even scalar h has the couplings of the Higgs particle of the Standard Model. We note that in the decoupling limit [15] defined by $m_A^2 \gg |\lambda_i| v^2$ subject to a condition of perturbativity $|\lambda_i| \lesssim 4\pi$, we also find $\sin(\beta-\alpha) \approx 1$. (The relation between these λ_i and ours may be found in [15].) Although we find from our computations in this paper that m_A



FIG. 2. Allowed mass range (in GeV) for the charged Higgs and the heavy CP even Higgs in (a) type I (b) type II (c) lepton specific and (d) flipped 2HDM for $|\lambda_5| \leq 4\pi$ and $\tan\beta = 5$

must be large, we do not require it a priori, so our results are valid for the SM-like alignment limit of the 2HDMs, without going to the decoupling limit. It is worth pointing out that the issue of distinguishing between the decoupling limit and the SM-like scenario was first explored in [37].

Perturbativity requires that the quartic couplings of the physical Higgs fields are small. Our choice of $|\lambda_i| \leq 4\pi$ keeps the models inside the perturbative regime, and this requirement also keeps $m_A \lesssim 617$ GeV. Allowing for larger values of λ_i would also allow higher values of m_A as well as of m_H and m_ξ. In that sense, what we have found in this paper are the lower bounds on the masses of H, A, and $\xi^\pm$, in the SM-like limit of 2HDMs.

The most important parameter in the 2HDMs is $\tan\beta$. There is no consensus on the value of $\tan\beta$, except that it should be larger than unity, based on constraints coming from $Z \to b\bar{b}$ and $B_q\bar{B}_q$ mixing [28]. Several arguments have been proffered for a large $\tan\beta$ in

2HDMs of different types, using muon $g-2$ in lepton specific 2HDM [27], or using $b \to s\gamma$ in type I and flipped models [38], which also suppresses the $t \to bH^+$ branching ratio to a rough agreement with 95% CL limits from the light charged Higgs searches at the LHC [39, 40]. A large value of $\tan\beta$ also makes the heavy Higgs particle difficult to detect [41]. We have used a conservative $\tan\beta = 5$ to estimate the scalar masses m_H and $m_{\xi^\pm}$ — note that m_A is not very far from m_H because of the degeneracy relation (3.6). A larger $\tan\beta$ makes the $m_H - m_A$ degeneracy more pronounced, so the inequality band becomes narrower. This narrows the ranges of m_H and m_ξ, also pushing the region of overlap upwards, making the heavy and charged Higgses more difficult to detect. Recent analyses of LHC data at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, as a search for the pseudoscalar Higgs particle, also appear to favor a value of 5 or larger for $\tan\beta$ near the alignment limit [42, 43] .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank B. Grzadkowski, B. Swiezewska and X.-F. Han for useful comments, and the anonymous referee for informing us about Ref. [37]. AB wishes to thank D. Das for useful discussions.

---

[1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], *"Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,"* Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012).

[2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *"Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC,"* Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012).

[3] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher and J. P. Silva, *"Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models,"* Phys. Rept. **516**, 1 (2012)

[4] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *"CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,"* Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977).

[5] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *"Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,"* Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1791 (1977).

[6] N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, *"Electroweak baryogenesis in the two doublet model,"* Nucl. Phys.

B **358**, 471 (1991).

[7] E. Ma, *"Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter,"* Phys. Rev. D **73**, 077301 (2006).

[8] E. Ma, *"Utility of a Special Second Scalar Doublet,"* Mod. Phys. Lett. A **23**, 647 (2008).

[9] R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and V. S. Rychkov, *"Improved naturalness with a heavy Higgs: An Alternative road to LHC physics,"* Phys. Rev. D **74**, 015007 (2006) [hep-ph/0603188].

[10] P. M. Ferreira and D. R. T. Jones, *"Bounds on scalar masses in two Higgs doublet models,"* JHEP **0908**, 069 (2009) [arXiv:0903.2856 [hep-ph]]. [42]

[11] T. D. Lee, *"A Theory of Spontaneous T Violation,"* Phys. Rev. D **8**, 1226 (1973).

[12] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, *"The Higgs Hunter's Guide,"* Front. Phys. **80**, 1 (2000).

[13] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, *"Errata for the Higgs hunter's guide,"* arXiv:hep-ph/9302272.

[14] G. C. Branco, W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *"Relating the scalar flavor changing neutral couplings to the CKM matrix,"* Phys. Lett. B **380**, 119 (1996)

[15] J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, *"The CP conserving two Higgs doublet model: The Approach to the decoupling limit,"* Phys. Rev. D **67**, 075019 (2003)

[16] P. M. Ferreira, J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber and R. Santos, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 11, 115003 (2014) [arXiv:1403.4736 [hep-ph]].

[17] M. J. G. Veltman, *"The Infrared - Ultraviolet Connection,"* Acta Phys. Polon. B **12**, 437 (1981).

[18] C. Newton and T. T. Wu, *"Mass relations in the two Higgs doublet model from the absence of quadratic divergences,"* Z. Phys. C **62**, 253 (1994).

[19] S. L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, *"Natural Conservation Laws for Neutral Currents,"* Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1958 (1977).

[20] E. A. Paschos, *"Diagonal Neutral Currents,"* Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1966 (1977).

[21] A. Pich and P. Tuzon, *"Yukawa Alignment in the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model,"* Phys. Rev. D **80**, 091702 (2009).

[22] P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, *"Renormalization-group constraints on Yukawa alignment in multi-Higgs-doublet models,"* Phys. Lett. B **688**, 341 (2010).

[23] B. Grzadkowski and P. Osland, *"Tempered Two-Higgs-Doublet Model,"* Phys. Rev. D **82**,

125026 (2010).

[24] R. Jora, S. Nasri and J. Schechter, *"Naturalness in a simple two Higgs doublet model,"* Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28**, 1350036 (2013).

[25] A. G. Akeroyd, A. Arhrib and E. M. Naimi, *"Note on tree level unitarity in the general two Higgs doublet model,"* Phys. Lett. B **490**, 119 (2000)

[26] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], *Review of Particle Physics (RPP),* Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012) and 2013 partial update for the 2014 edition.

[27] J. Cao, P. Wan, L. Wu and J. M. Yang, *"Lepton-Specific Two-Higgs Doublet Model: Experimental Constraints and Implication on Higgs Phenomenology,"* Phys. Rev. D **80**, 071701 (2009).

[28] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik, C. H. Chen, R. Guedes and R. Santos, *"Double Neutral Higgs production in the Two-Higgs doublet model at the LHC,"* JHEP **0908**, 035 (2009).

[29] M. Sher, *"Electroweak Higgs Potentials and Vacuum Stability,"* Phys. Rept. **179**, 273 (1989).

[30] J. Maalampi, J. Sirkka and I. Vilja, *"Tree level unitarity and triviality bounds for two Higgs models,"* Phys. Lett. B **265**, 371 (1991).

[31] S. Kanemura, T. Kubota and E. Takasugi, *"Lee-Quigg-Thacker bounds for Higgs boson masses in a two doublet model,"* Phys. Lett. B **313**, 155 (1993).

[32] J. Horejsi and M. Kladiva, *"Tree-unitarity bounds for THDM Higgs masses revisited,"* Eur. Phys. J. C **46**, 81 (2006).

[33] G. Bhattacharyya, D. Das, P. B. Pal and M. N. Rebelo, *"Scalar sector properties of two-Higgs-doublet models with a global U(1) symmetry,"* JHEP **1310**, 081 (2013).

[34] H. J. He, N. Polonsky and S. f. Su, *"Extra families, Higgs spectrum and oblique corrections,"* Phys. Rev. D **64**, 053004 (2001).

[35] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, O. M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *"A Precision constraint on multi-Higgs-doublet models,"* J. Phys. G **35**, 075001 (2008).

[36] M. Baak and R. Kogler, *"The global electroweak Standard Model fit after the Higgs discovery"*, arXiv:1306.0571 [hep-ph].

[37] I. F. Ginzburg and M. Krawczyk, *"Symmetries of two Higgs doublet model and CP violation,"* Phys. Rev. D **72**, 115013 (2005)

[38] J. h. Park, *"Lepton non-universality at LEP and charged Higgs,"* JHEP **0610**, 077 (2006).

[39] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], *"Search for charged Higgs bosons decaying via $H^+ \to \tau\nu$*

in top quark pair events using pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ *TeV with the ATLAS detector,"* JHEP **1206**, 039 (2012).

[40] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *"Search for a light charged Higgs boson in top quark decays in pp collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 7$ *TeV,"* JHEP **1207**, 143 (2012).

[41] L. Randall, *"Two Higgs Models for Large Tan Beta and Heavy Second Higgs,"* JHEP **0802**, 084 (2008).

[42] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], *"Search for a CP-odd Higgs boson decaying to Zh in pp collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 8$ *TeV with the ATLAS detector,"* Phys. Lett. B **744**, 163 (2015).

[43] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *"Search for a pseudoscalar boson decaying into a Z boson and the 125 GeV Higgs boson in llbb final states,"* arXiv:1504.04710 [hep-ex].